



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,620	03/18/2002	Jeremy C. Rosenberg	2917-117	3143

6449 7590 03/24/2009  
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.  
1425 K STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
----------

FORD, GRANT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2441

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

03/24/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/098,620	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ROSENBERG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> GRANT FORD	<b>Art Unit</b> 2441	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) GRANT FORD. (3) Brian Rosenbloom.

(2) Ajay Bhatia. (4) Jeremy Rosenberg.

Date of Interview: 24 February 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: De Bonet.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants discussed the differences between the instant invention and the prior art of De Bonet. Applicant discussed the use of the phrase "broadcast recording" in the instant claim language. Applicant and the Examiner discussed claim language which would help to distinguish the instant claim language from the cited prior art. No agreement was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Ajay Bhatia/ Examiner, Art Unit 2445	
------------------------------------------	--